



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

teachers of Caesar (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2. 100-102).

One came away from the meeting as a whole with decidedly optimistic feelings and with the conviction that the cause of the Classics in the Middle West and South is in good hands. C. K.

#### A CHAPTER FROM AN UNPUBLISHED LATIN SYNTAX, WITH PREFATORY DISCUSSION

(Concluded from page 196.)

It would be a comparatively simple matter to give the laws governing the use of *antequam* (*priusquam*), if it were true and sufficiently definitive to say that the Indicative was used wherever the dependent verb denoted an actual fact or something viewed as an actual fact, and the Subjunctive wherever the dependent verb expressed something Proposed, Expected or Anticipated or something viewed as Proposed, etc. Such, however, is not the case, and the situation is further complicated by the fact that the presence of a negative in the main clause in some categories alters the tense and affects the question of mood.

The reason for this influence of the negative becomes manifest when we consider that *antequam* itself, as Professor Gildersleeve says of  $\pi\eta\lambda\upsilon$ , is a *comparative* formation; from this a distinctly *negative* character follows.

Since it is itself negative, the importance of the negative, expressed or implied, in the leading clause is obvious; for the free negative nullifies the negative in the conjunction and inverts the antecedence and subsequence of the principal and subordinate clauses. This is necessarily significant in a language whose ground plan of tense-usage is based upon the antecedence and subsequence of actions whose time is brought into comparison.

Even after this has been noted, however, the question of tense is not solved, for no strictly logical scheme of tense-usage is followed.

In general, the choice of a tense in Latin in a subordinate clause depends upon the relation of coincidence, antecedence, or subsequence existing between the action of the principal and that of the subordinate verb. In the case of *antequam*, 'before', however, this relation of priority and subsequence seems sufficiently indicated by the conjunction itself. This affords a baffling and elusive problem. The Present Indicative occurs in some future sentences, the Future Perfect in others, and the simple Future is excluded from use. In a certain type of sentence the relation of priority and subsequence seems to have been felt by the Latin writer to be sufficiently indicated by the meaning of the conjunction and is not indicated by the tense, while in sentences of another type both the conjunction and the tense are deemed necessary to express the relationship.

In the 'generic sentence' of the Present after an

affirmative leading clause, the Present Subjunctive is generally used in the *antequam* clause; but after a negative leading clause the Perfect Indicative is the rule.

In regard to the Subjunctive, it at once appears how difficult it is to make a comprehensive statement. It can be fairly well demonstrated that, in *past* sentences in which the action of the subordinate clause was 'looked forward to', the dependent clause employed the Imperfect Subjunctive; but the same principle applied to *future* sentences is not verified by the usage of the language, for a large majority of such sentences with affirmative leading clauses use the Present *Indicative*, while practically all with negative leading sentences use the Future Perfect Indicative. Some grammarians cite the Present Subjunctive in 'general truths' as an extension of the so-called 'anticipatory' Subjunctive; but these same 'general truths', as stated above, quite regularly employ a Perfect *Indicative*, if the leading clause is negative.

These and other considerations have forced me, after many efforts at condensation, to the conclusion that it is hardly possible to give an adequate statement without making a definite distinction between present, future, and past time, and between affirmative and negative sentences under each.

The limits of this paper will not permit my giving the statistics or grounds for the rules given in Part II. These have been given at length in my published work on the subject<sup>1</sup>, which was based upon a study of all examples of *antequam* (*priusquam*) occurring in the Latin literature down to the end of the first century of our era. It is desirable, however, that the reader be acquainted with the special considerations which have influenced part of the statement in regard to the usage after 'an affirmative leading sentence of the past', even though this cannot be done satisfactorily in so short an article.

In establishing what should be the statement here, several considerations must be kept in mind.

It is fairly evident that the usage of Cicero has been mainly responsible for the rule that, when the dependent clause denoted a fact or bore a simply temporal relation to the leading clause, the Indicative should be used; for in Cicero we find nearly twice as many examples of this Indicative as are found in all of the other prose writers combined down to Suetonius. Cicero has fifty-two examples of the Perfect Indicative in the *antequam* clause after an affirmative leading sentence; Caesar has none; Sallust has one, and it may be questioned; Nepos has none; and Livy, out of a total of more than one hundred and fifty examples with affirmative past leading sentence, has only three Indicatives.

<sup>1</sup> *Antequam and Priusquam. With Special Reference to the Historical Development of their Subjunctive Usage.* The Lord Baltimore Press (1903). 107 pages.

Even in the early language, sentences of the past employed the Imperfect Subjunctive in the *antequam* clause in cases in which 'volition', or the desire to prevent the dependent action, was felt; or in which *antequam* was felt to be equivalent to *antequam ut*, where the action of the main verb occurred too soon for the accomplishment of the dependent action; or in which the action of the dependent verb was 'looked forward to' from the leading clause; or where *antequam* had the sense of *potius quam*.

It is obvious how large a proportion of the affirmative sentences of the past these four types would cover; and studying all of the examples which have come down to us it is not hard to follow the spread of this use of the Subjunctive from examples which clearly belonged in one of these categories to sentences which less definitely fell under them, and finally to sentences in which the relation between the clauses seems purely temporal.

As early as Lucretius this result may be observed. Lucretius shows several examples of the Imperfect Subjunctive in purely temporal clauses. Cicero has at least two examples of it in his late writings. Caesar affords *no* example of the Perfect Indicative after an affirmative leading clause, but it is not possible to say that any single example of the Imperfect Subjunctive in his writings is in a purely temporal clause; some of them so present themselves to the mind at first glance but it is possible to refer each one of them to one of the Subjunctive categories mentioned in the previous paragraph. Livy, however, has many examples of it, as have nearly all of the later writers.

These facts give some intimation of the extent to which the Imperfect Subjunctive had encroached upon the sphere of the Perfect Indicative. From the meager evidence available it is fair to assume that the Perfect Indicative did hold its own in sentences of a purely temporal type in the early language. In the classical period Cicero is the stronghold of these Indicatives. But an examination of all of the occurrences of them in Cicero indicates a notably restricted use of them and points to a gradual yielding on his part to the increasing prevalence of the Subjunctive.

Of Cicero's examples of the Indicative in the Orations about two thirds occur in orations delivered during the first ten years of his public life. Of the eighteen examples in his late philosophical and rhetorical works, thirteen show the *antequam* clause modified by a temporal phrase, and three have the dependent verb in the first or second person. In the Letters we find thirteen examples, in all but one of which the verb is in the first or second person.

The vernacular, and consequently writings characterized by colloquial style, resist longer than more formal composition a change from an old language

usage. Consequently we might expect to find the Perfect Indicative in the Letters, if anywhere in Cicero. But we also note that all but one of these examples has the first or second person of the dependent verb; which, itself a characteristic of the colloquial style, in our sentences affords an additional reason for the employment of the Indicative, inasmuch as the acts in which 'you' and 'I' have been concerned present themselves to our minds much more emphatically as actual facts than those in which the third person has been the principal actor.

It is also true that when the *antequam* clause is modified by a phrase of time, such as 'a little while', 'ten days', or the like, the *fact* of the occurrence of the dependent clause is emphasized in one's mind.

If we summarize the usage of Cicero with reference to these considerations, we shall find that three fourths of his examples of the Perfect Indicative after an affirmative leading sentence are of a special type which emphasizes the dependent clause as a fact, and that of the remaining one fourth (fourteen sentences which have neither a temporal modifying phrase nor the verb in the first or second person) five examples belong to the author's earliest writings and one occurs in the Letters.

If, then, we bear in mind that Plautus and Terence used the Perfect Indicative, only, in sentences in which the relation between the clauses was purely temporal, we may conclude that the rule of early usage was that the Perfect Indicative must be used in this case, the Imperfect Subjunctive only in cases in which other factors appeared; that by a natural development the Imperfect Subjunctive widened its sphere until as early as Lucretius it appears in purely temporal clauses. We may infer, further, that during the period of Cicero's activity the Indicative was continually giving way to the Subjunctive, for late in his life he himself employs it twice in purely temporal clauses and we have just seen how rarely he used the Indicative, especially in his late writings, except in sentences to which the 'actual fact' conception was *peculiarly* applicable. By the time of Livy the Subjunctive seems to have been the rule and the Indicative the exception; though the Indicative does appear occasionally for a century longer.

In the statement given in Part II covering this point, the writer has proceeded upon the assumption that a statement should not be formulated with reference to the usage of Cicero alone but that due consideration should also be given to the usage of other prose writers of what has been called the Golden Age of Latin Literature.

## II. USAGE OF ANTEQUAM OR PRIUSQUAM (SOMETIMES ANTE . . . QUAM OR PRIUS . . . QUAM).

The conjunction *antequam* or *priusquam*, before,

is used sometimes with the Indicative, sometimes with the Subjunctive, as indicated in the rules which follow.

The presence or absence of a negative in the leading sentence is of prime importance.

The Imperfect, Future, and Pluperfect Indicative and the Perfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive (except in O.O.) are so rare that they may be considered excluded from use in normal prose.

#### *Sentences of Present Time.*

*Antequam (priusquam)* sentences of the Present are practically confined to 'generic' sentences (sentences expressing a customary, habitual, or repeated action). For the Historical Present, see Note 1.

#### AFFIRMATIVE LEADING CLAUSE.

The Generic Sentence of the Present with *affirmative* leading clause regularly employs the Present Subjunctive in the *antequam (priusquam)* clause, but, where the sense of the dependent verb permits, it may employ the Perfect Indicative. (The Present Indicative is archaic).

*Subjunctive:* Cic. De Orat. 1. 251 tragoedi qui . . . cotidie, antequam pronuntient, vocem . . . sensim excitant.

Sen. Nat. Quaest. 2.12.6 ante autem videmus fulgorem quam sonum audiamus.

*Indicative:* Cic. De Fin. 3.66 membris utimur prius quam didicimus cuius ea causa utilitatis habeamus. (If we substitute here *scio* for *disco*, we write *sciamus*).

#### NEGATIVE LEADING CLAUSE.

The Generic Sentence of the Present with *negative* leading clause regularly employs the Perfect Indicative in the *antequam (priusquam)* clause.

Cic. De Leg. 2. 57 nam prius quam in os iniecta glaeba est, locus ille, ubi crematum est, nihil habet religionis.

Note 1. Sentences in which the leading verb is Historical Present follow the rules given for past sentences. It is permissible, however, to allow the sequence to conform to the tense rather than to the sense.

#### *Sentences of Past Time.*

#### AFFIRMATIVE LEADING CLAUSE.

After an affirmative past leading clause the Imperfect Subjunctive is used to denote: (a) that the subject of the leading verb 'looked forward to' the dependent action, either with or without 'desire' to prevent it; (b) that the dependent action was prevented (either temporarily or permanently) by the action of the leading verb; (c) that the relation between the clauses was purely temporal, though Cicero prefers the Perfect Indicative here, especially where the dependent clause was emphasized as an actual fact.

*Purpose:* Livy 25.18.14 Badius, priusquam opprimeretur, . . . equo relicto ad suos aufugit.

*Looking forward to:* Cic. Tusc. 4.49 hi conlocuti (sunt) inter se, prius quam manum conserebant, leniter et quiete.

*Prevention:* Livy 35.27.7 multi prius incendio absumpti sunt, quam hostium adventum sentirent.

*Prevention:* Cic. Verr. 2.4.147 nam antequam verbum facerem, de sella surrexit atque abiit.

*Purely:* Cic. Phil. 14.27 (sol) antequam se abderet, . . . fugientem vidit Antonium.

Cic. Lael. 96 id actum est . . . quinquennio ante quam consul factus sum.

#### NEGATIVE LEADING CLAUSE.

After a negative past leading clause the Perfect Indicative is used in the *antequam (priusquam)* clause, unless one desires to emphasize the idea of 'volition', which here takes the form of 'insistence' upon the action of the dependent verb; in this case the Imperfect Subjunctive is used.

*Indicative:* Caes. B. G. 1.53.1 neque prius fugere destiterunt quam ad flumen . . . pervenerunt.

*Subjunctive:* Nepos Themist. 8.4 inde non prius

*Insistence:* egressus est, quam rex eum . . . in fidem reciperet.

Note. After both affirmative and negative leading clauses the 'generic' sentence of the past employs the Imperfect Subjunctive in the *antequam* clause.

#### *Sentences of Future Time.*

#### AFFIRMATIVE LEADING CLAUSE.

After an affirmative future leading clause the *antequam (priusquam)* clause usually employs the Present Indicative. The Present Subjunctive, however, is preferred, if the leading verb is an imperative; elsewhere it is rare.

Cic. Fam. 11.27.1 de qua priusquam respondeo, pauca proponam.

Livy 45.12.5 priusquam hoc circulo excedas, . . . , redde responsum.

(rare) Cic. Leg. 2.53 is videlicet, antequam *veniat* in Pontum, litteras . . . mittet.

#### NEGATIVE LEADING CLAUSE.

After a negative future leading clause the *antequam (priusquam)* clause regularly employs the Future Perfect Indicative.

Cic. Cato Maior 18 de qua vereri non ante desinam, quam illam excisam esse cognovero.

Livy 44.39.9 novom iter aperui neque prius, quam debellavero, abistam.

WALTER HULLIHEN.

UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH, Sewanee, Tennessee.